DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 093 CS 502 232

AUTHOR Howell, Gladys David
TITLE Intercultural Communication and the Concept of Marginality.
PUB DATE Jul 78
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Summer Conference on Intercultural Communication (Tampa, Florida, July 17-21, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; *Biculturalism; Bilingualism; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Cultural Interrelationships; *Cultural Pluralism; Information Theory; Minority Groups; Self Concept; Social Structure; Sociocultural Patterns
IDENTIFIERS *Intercultural Communication

ABSTRACT

The complex mosaic of cultural and racial heterogeneity in America throughout the twentieth century has given rise to various sociological perspectives to interpret the evolving interaction patterns and to give clues to the direction that policy decisions should take. The major theoretical frames of reference have been assimilation and cultural pluralism. The former has usually implied Anglo conformity, with the desired goal of integration of minorities into the mainstream. The latter has stressed the desirability of somewhat separatist social institutions and the retention of cultural identity by minority groups, usually with continued use of the native language (except for blacks) at least within the context of primary group interaction. Either of these processes can lead a minority group member to a socio-psychological state termed marginality. Within the assimilation model, even if Anglo conformity is accomplished, social distance still maintained by members of the dominant group may interfere with the deep, intense communication necessary to give a minority member access to primary groups and a sense of belonging. Within the cultural pluralism model, bilingualism may set up impediments to fluency in either language; further, the problem of meaningful communication with members of the dominant group may be exacerbated. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED161093

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION AND THE CONCEPT OF MARGINALITY

Gladys David Howell
Associate Professor of Sociology
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gladys David Howell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper Presented to the

Conference on Intercultural Communication
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

July, 1978

C 5562 232

Introduction

The concept of intercultural communication can be applied to a variety of social contexts: international relations, contact and interaction between colonial agent (administrator, business entrepreneur, missionary, and the like) and native population, or interaction and social relations between socially and culturally differentiated segments of a heterogeneous society. This paper will focus on the latter type, presenting and analyzing certain aspects of intercultural communication between the dominant official structures and various minority groups within the complex mosais of contemporar American society. Of special relevance for the points developed herein is the analysis of the ideological framework from which patterns of communication as well as related policy decisions emerge vis-à-vis various minorities and the consequences of these factors for members of the subordinate groups. At the individual level some patterns may result in widespread existence of a psychological state of marginality, which can, in turn, lead to various possible group reactions. Central to the analysis of intercultural communication in this context is the question of bilingualism as a pattern and/or right of minority members. For some groups the question of bilingualism is tied in with educational policy in the public schools; for others, bilingualis has been a matter of voluntaristic patterns within family and/or ethnic community structures.

Background of Dominant-Minority Social Structure in the United States

During the twentieth century there has evolved in the United States a shift of emphasis in ideology and in official policies related to the desired end results of intergroup relations between the white, predominantly Protestant

group of Anglo-Saxon background which had established itself as dominant in terms of power, prestige, and wealth, and subordinant groups, both racial and ethnic, which comprised an intricate complexity of minority groups. In the first few decades there was a clear emphasis on the assimilation process as the desirable mode, the assumption being that the minorities would in time become like the dominant group in all significant ways and would then be ready for inclusion in the relationships and institutional structures which would lead to upward mobility. While in some of the early sociological literature (Park, a.) there is some implication that the assimilation process is, by nature and by definition, a two-way street involving a mutual exchange of traits with a new hybrid social identity as the end result, this melting pot emphasis has not withstood the test of emerging history. In actuality, assimilation has been a matter of Anglo conformity, either officially enforced or brought about by the nature of prestige and power distribution among groups.

To illustrate the degree to which Anglo conformity was, in fact, the basic pattern, both ideologically and officially, within the United States, one need only contemplate the connotation of the term "Americanization" and the Americanization programs developed for immigrants in evidence in various institutional settings in the early decades of the century. These were programs first of all dedicated to training in the English language as the basis of interaction between minority member and dominant member in all settings. Another evidence that is even more telling involved not immigrants but the indigenous native American groups dispersed unevenly throughout the nation, both on reservations and in towns. In federally sponsored as well as missionary schools English was the mandatory language, often with severe

sanctions being imposed for the use of the native tongue. A further clear example could be drawn from the imposition of religious beliefs by missionaries providing education on the young charges sent to them. Native Indian religion, a basic underpinning of the cultural world view and frame of reference, was to be rooted out and supplanted by Christianity, often sectarian, to the greatest degree possible. Thus, the prohibition against the Sun Dance in Plains Indian groups struck down a powerful integrating ritual that gave the culture its vitality and provided the various tribes with a strong sense of cohesion and esprit-de-corps.

These fragmentary examples are simply by way of illustrating that the often-expressed faith in the ideology of the melting pot was, in fact, based on an assumption that worthy minority members would understand the superiority of the dominant group's way of life and would assimilate to it through conscious effort and imitation. Official policies clearly exemplify the degree to which the Anglo conformity attitude was operative. The concern about the new immigration that was cresting in the early decades of the century and the policies of restriction that evolved present the most cogent evidence. Populations from certain nations, those least like the dominant group, were to be restricted severely or totally. Those nations whose cultures were congruent with that of the American dominant group were encouraged to send members to these shores. The immigration laws of the 1920's provide the official death knell of the melting-pot ideology and herald the expressed assumption of a rank order of worth and value of the groups composing the American population at that time.

In the twenties a competing ideology to the melting-pot assimilationist one appeared. Jane Addams (Addams) expressed deep respect for the cultures

and crafts of the immigrant groups she worked with at Hull House and deplored the loss that would result if assimilation meant the end of what had been brought over. Kallen (Kallen) developed the view that minorities should be encouraged to develop self-contained substructures within the American democracy with a complex cultural pluralism viewed as the desired end result. Thus a fledgling ideology in competition with the melting pot, or more accurately Anglo conformity, point of view evolved. While other scholars (Adamic) also sponsored the notion of a "nation of nations" as the best goal for America, this cultural pluralism model generally had less influence on policy than the older assimilation approach until the period of social ferment and change ushered in by the Civil Rights movement of the late fifties and early sixties. Beginning with demands for black power (Carmichael and Hamilton) the cultural pluralism revolution took many forms, including demands for self-determination, separate territories to compensate for past wrongs, and community control of schools and other urban institutions, to mention a few.

In summary, one may say that assimilation, practiced in America as Anglo conformity, presented an ideology which seemed to represent an egalitari view of all groups but in fact reflected a real and clearly implied rank ordering of minority groups on a scale of superior to inferior, those most like the dominant group being highly evaluated, those least like the dominant group being devalued and targeted for discrimination and expressed pronounced social distance. For members of various minorities, this would lead to an attempt to enter the mainstream of American life, gambling on the degree of acceptance, hence of success, one might encounter in assimilating. Conforming to the dominant's language and other cultural attributes would be seen as a minimal requirement; acceptance as a participant in the world of work, school,

club, play and marriage market would be more problematic, depending as it does on the receptiveness of dominant members.

Cultural pluralism, as an ideology of scholars, implied separatism with equality of groups as the framework. The goal would be a pattern on the model of Switzerland with a balance between groups who maintained separate institutions and social networks, but coordinated in some overriding institutional arrangements, such as government and economic activities. Language, religion, marriage patterns would remain intact for each group. In actuality, cultural pluralism of this type is far from the reality which America seems capable of delivering to most minorities at the present time. The rank ordering of groups referred to above, does in fact set the framework for the pattern of cultural pluralism which is possible; this leads to separate but unequal as the existing pattern and raises questions about what changes in policy would be necessary to promote cultural pluralism of the ideal type.

The foregoing is not intended as a complete review of the literature on the theoretical perspectives on dominant-minority relations. Rather the purpose is to provide a broad background for discussing the concept of marginality and relating this concept to present efforts in bilingual educatio

The Concept of the Marginal Man

Park (Park, B) first used the concept of the marginal man in 1928 in an essay on human migrations and their consequences in terms of social processes. Building on this conceptualization a student of Park's (Stonequist sharpened and expanded on its manifestations in a monograph. Stonequist's study remains comprehensive and highly stimulating in that it applies the concept to situations drawn from various geographic and national settings, in

both the colonial and developed nation model. The range of his typologies and abundant illustrations presents rich possibilities for explorations of problems in the contemporary world.

While Park stressed and Stonequist elaborated on the psychological dimensions of the marginal man phenomenon, the latter included the cultural aspects of the determinants as well as the social consequences involved in the various types of resolution that may occur.

It is mainly, however, with the psychological dilemma that Stonequist deals in his study, and in presenting a resume of his ideas, it is the psychological dimension on wich one must concentrate. Stonequest (p.3) states: "The individual who through migration, education, marriage, or some other influence leaves one social group or culture without making a satisfactory adjustment to another finds himself on the margin of each but a member of neither." This is his broad definition of the marginal man or person. It is clear that the concept can have applicability to a wide range of social phenomena, embracing social mobility, religious conversion, geographic mobility; but it is most impressively relevant to the psychic discomfiture of minority members within a complex society.

Not all members of immigrant or racial groups fall into the state of mind described by Stonequist. Some members find umbrage in the minority enclave, live in a separatist world, and thus never feel the tensions of marginality. This is especially apt to be a possible adaptation for wives in the first generation of immigrants. Stonequist notes a difficulty experienced by the second generation members who, attending school with dominant group teachers and, sometimes, fellow students, experience either a clearly expressed or subtle devaluation of their group and culture. This can lead to the rejection of the parental group and the psychic state of

marginality. Stonequist describes the state of mind as characterized by a deep inferiority complex and a sense of belonging nowhere.

Of the three possible modes of adaptation which Stonequist discusses as possible avenues out of the marginal self-conception, the nationalist role, the intermediary role and assimilation (pp. 159-200) the first and third have relevance to the thoughts being developed herein, since both involve not only individual, or psychological, dimensions but group, or sociological, dimensions as well. In the nationalistic mode the marginal person harks back to the value of his parental culture and social group, becomes militant and ethnocentric in behalf of this subordinated group, and, depending on the circumstances, strives for the group's independence from the dominant group's control or for greater equality within the nation. In the assimilation mode the marginal person relinquishes his original heritage to the highest degree possible and through every means available, including both passing and intermarriage, seeks to lose his minority identification. The difficulties of this process are compounded by the unknown aspects of the reactions of dominant group members whose receptivity are vital to its success.

In summary, then, Park's basic concept, developed and refined by Stonequist, is essentially a psychological concept with hints as to its sociological extensions and implications. While assimilation may take place on the individual level, a nationalistic movement must involve a large number of individuals simultaneously experiencing the psychological dilemma of marginality.

The Concept of the Marginal Group

Gordon (Gordan), in an article in 1941, described a shared pattern of adaptation by Jewish Americans of the second and third generation and called this pattern a marginal culture. He implies that when a group of like-situated marginal individuals begin to experience ready-made adaptive accommodations to their in-between status a marginal culture has evolved. The phenomenon described by him would seem more accurately designated an early phase of assimilation. His examples seem to typify transitional processes rather than marginality, for there is little in his material to suggest the sense of isolation and devaluation so crucial in the earlier treatment.

There is, however, a need for a concept to identify the group manifestation of the psychological sense of inferiority and alienation described by Stonequist. The term marginal group seems useful in providing a label for this phenonmenon. The term would not apply to a group of people who share the kind of marginal culture described by Gordon; his illustrations imply a rather clear sense of identity and a social structure for socialization into developed patterns available to the individual. The term marginal group,as presented here, would refer to a collectivity of alienated individuals who simultaneously realize their rejection by the dominant society and their sense of inferiority about their own racial or cultural heritage. Clearly, in its initial stages such a collectivity would have no internal organization, sense of unity, or well established adaptive mechanisms. A more accurate designation might be marginal category; this would provide the clue to the dissociated nature of psychic marginality. The term marginal group is useful, however, in that it can be applied to

the stages of change through which the collectivity may progress as the sense of marginality gives rise to a new sense of unity and to adaptive processes to relieve the psychic and social disadvantage and discomfort.

Social and Cultural Patterns Contributing to Marginality

In terms of ethnic and racial patterns, a large number of persons simultaneously experiencing a sense of marginality is likely to arise in a heterogeneous society that is dynamic, or rapidly changing, and characterized by an emphasis on achieved as opposed to ascribed status. If the value system of the society embraces equality of opportunity and inherent worth of the individual as stressed ideals while the real situation provides institutionalized patterns of inequality and a hierarchy of prestige based on ethnicity and race, again one might expect to find a high incidence of marginal persons. Marginality seems more likely to occur when individuals anticipate acceptance in a new reference group of their choice, only to experience rebuff from their chosen significant others. Clearly, the American social order has provided the conditions under which a multitude of marginal persons could be predicted to emerge.

The situation has varied for members of different minorities and in different time frames. For American blacks there has been such a profusion of special status, discriminatory economic and social institutions as to require separate treatment, taking all variables into account. With respect to other minorities, including Native Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans and ethnic groups based on immigration from European and Asiatic countries, some attention must be given to the official structures in the society which define the broad policies providing the framework in which

intergroup interaction is expressed. Especially crucial is the school which, for the minority child, is often the crucible of identity. Trends and counter-trends in educational policy are critical areas of investigation in any study of the phenomenon of marginality.

Forms of Intercultural Communication

In the light of what has been said about the broad framework in which intercultural contact and interaction transpires in the American setting, there is clear indication that communication between groups is often based on a multiplicity of forms that reflect ethnocentrism within groups, the expression of negative feelings and processes toward out-groups, with minority members receiving the brunt of the disadvantage involved. Recognition should be made of the fact that minorities often feel and exhibit their own ethnocentricity and, as in the violent exchanges of the sixties, can express their disaffection and conflictive affect with force. Yet, in the long run in America, up to the present at least, the scale shows the weight of the unequal communication patterns to bear heavily on minority members.

Language is, of course, the most basic form of communication. Language as the distinguishing human characteristic has been commented on by anthropologists throughout the century. It is through language that a group encapsulates its answers to problems, develops its culture, expresses much of its sense of the aesthetic, evolves a sense of the supernatural and the group's relationship with it; it is language that provides the bonding of all segments who use it into a unified whole; it is language that channels perceptions and gives the clues to appropriate behavior. It is no wonder that the assimilation idealists of earlier decades felt strongly that English would be the great

binding force that would knit together the diversified subgroups in the nation. It was on this assumption that the use of languages other than English in schools came to be prohibited, this despite the fact that in the first two decades of the century there were schools in areas of heavy ethnic concentration offering bilingual education. The First World War and the ethnocentric backlash of the 1920's put an end to bilingual efforts until the present period.

There are, in addition to language in use in the workaday world of social interaction, special ways in which intercultural communication occurs. Through the various mass media, stereotypes of different groups take a highly graphic form and become part of the content of culture shaping the attitudes members of one group hold of another, again with the minority members bearing the burden of negative implications. Ethnic jokes and slurs, finding expression through mass media as well as through a remarkable grapevine of a less formal type, (is there any way to time the spread of a Polish joke from its point of origin to the most remote corners of the nation?) are an example of an insidious form of intercultural communication.

Intercultural communication has also been accomplished within the framework of mass movements, such as the Civil Rights Movement of the late fifties, and all of the offshoots of this source in such forms as Red Power, Gay Liberation Front, and so on. Mass movements as forms of intercultural communication are relevant to thoughts being developed here because these movements have been the means whereby marginal persons have been transformed into marginal groups with a possibility of changing their situation. Mass movemovements, using slogans such as Red Power, Chicano Power and the like, serve notice that the basis for intercultural communication is ripe for change.

This outline in no sense exhausts the modes and forms of intercultural communication. Postures, gestures, in short body languages in all its manifestations, could be remarked on. Facial expressions, whether they are belligerent, subservient, or condescending, for example, are part of the patterning of intercultural communication.

The topic of intercultural communication, then, covers the entire gambit of ways in which the dynamics of interaction within a complex, heterogeneous society take place. Of central interest here is the question of bilingualism as an issue of policy for government and of personal choice for minority members.

The questions related to bilingualism to which the remainder of this paper will be devoted can be stated by the following questions: (1) Are there ways in which the phenomenon of bilingualism contributes to the development of a sense of marginality? (2) If there are, what are the conditions under which this occurs? (3) What is some of the evidence from specific case studies of diverse groups that provides insights into ways in which bilingualism could be an advantageious characteristic, leading to fuller access to the rewards of the society, rather than a liability? Central to these questions is the status of the group in question within the hierarchy of prestige and power in America, and the shifting emphasis in ideology away from assimilation and toward cultural pluralism. The 1968 Bilingual Education Act (Title VII of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act) provides a point of departure for guaging trends in the thinking of scholars and lawmakers in this area.

Effects of Patterns of Intercultural Communication in the U.S.

During the period of time from the 1920's through the late 1960's there seems to have been a tacit agreement among lawmakers, school boards and administrators, and members of the teaching profession that bilingualism was, in and of itself, a liability to the person in question. Evidence for this was usually drawn from standardized test data indicating the low achievement of youngsters whose first language, chronologically speaking, was something other than English. This idea had evolved early in the century, coinciding with the first widespread use of standardized tests during the First World War, and was tied in with the developing racist views that flowered at the same time. During the period in question the tests were assumed by many to be sacred cows of unquestioned validity; the social context in which a child lived and learned was ignored or denied as a factor.

The standardized tests themselves are a form of intercultural communication; the assumption that they are culture-free has been challenged and there is increasing recognition of the ways in which they may penalize the child of minority status.

It seems apparent that bilingualism of itself cannot be a liability. Those parts of the world characterized by polyglot groups living in close proximity present too many cases of bilingualism as a fact of life for everyone with no disadvantage associated with the practice. In fact, the truly disadvantaged person would be the one who did not understand all the languages in use. It is not then the learning and using of more than one language that causes problems for people. It is the social context of the the language usage that is the critical factor.

In the United States, despite the emphasis of equality and inherent worth of individuals in the American Creed, there has been a devaluing and

belittling of groups differing from the dominant group from the very beginning. The use of a language other than English has met with various forms of negative sanctions. For the adult conversing in a foreign language with a friend on the street, the sanction communicated might be a dirty look or the implication that rudeness was being expressed. For the child in school, still in the process of evolving a sense of identity, the sanctions were more far reaching. For all school children, but most especially for those in the early grades, the school represents an all-powerful institution with enormous coercive force. In fact, the public schools are an extension of the state and have a magnitude of compulsion that is easily apprehended. For minority children, it is in the school that the internalized conflict between the parental social group and culture and the larger official society often has its inception. If the teacher and school administrator must put in effect a policy denying the validity of the home culture, the child may well develop the sense of marginality described above.

A particularly articulate formulation of this state of emerging marginality was made before the Senate Subcommittee Hearings (Part I, 47) on the Bilingual Education Act by A. Bruce Gaader, then Chief of the Modern Language Section of the U. S. Office of Education:

> ....Language is the most important exteriorization or manifestation of the self, the human personality....If the school, the all-powerful school, rejects the mother tongue of an entire group of children, it can be expected to affect seriously and adversely those children's concept of their parents, their homes, and of themselves.

This quotation accurately puts the finger on the sore spot of impaired self-worth, deep feelings of inferiority, a rationale for the rejection of the parental world; in short, it identifies marginality.

One other quotation taken from the Senate Subcommittee Hearings (Part I, 73) bears repeating. Joseph Monserrat, then Director, Migration Division, Department

of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, New York, stated:

> ....The U.S. is one of the few countries in the world in which a man can consider himself educated and speak but one language, this despite the fact that the U.S. has probably been the outstanding country in receiving thousands and millions of people who have spoken all of the modern language of the world. .....One of the reasons we are a monolingual nation....is because historically to be different from the U.S. has meant to be less than. And one of the first things that historical, second-generation Americans have done in attempting to become Americans has been to give up the culture, the language, the religion and sometimes even the names of their parents in order to become American.

A professor of education before the House Subcommittee (Part III, 27) referred to the enforced assimilation of minority children in the public schools as promoting a rejection of the well-springs of identity and of personal self-affirmation.

The above quotations taken from the hearings of the Senate and House related to developing a federal program to foster bilingualism in education indicate several things about the conditions under which marginality is associated with bilingualism. The evidence seems to indicate that if two groups who are linguistically differentiated coexist in a community on a basis of equal status, bilingualism will be normative, useful and free of impediments to learning or to positive self-evaluations. If, on the other hand, two groups who are linguistically differentiated coexist in a community on a basis of unequal status, with the more prestigious group also holding the reins of power, the subordinate group members, especially in the formative years, will find bilingualism punishing and productive of feelings of marginality. Other factors associated with the subordinate status may contribute to problems of learning, truancy, dropping out of school as soon as possible, and perhaps more serious forms of deviance.

Note should be made of the compounding effects of unequal status in the light of the offical ideological statements related to equality. The Civil Rights Movement, under the leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., struck the most responsive chords within members of the dominant group when appealing to the discrepancy between the ideal and the real in the realm of dominant-minority relations. Within this context, the Movement also appealed to many marginal persons who found a plan of action for a greater stake in American society and, hence, a chance to shed the marginal onus. During the sixties multiple organizations, many of them based on ethnicity, were born to promote the interests of groups long subordinated and discriminated against. Minority members began to express a rejection of assimilation as a goal, not only because it seemed unattainable, but also because they wished to assert the worth of their ancestral cultures. During the same period scholars (Glazer and Moynihan) began to question the feasibility of assimilation as a societal goal for a social order characterized by such a complexity of racial and ethnic subgroups. The new emphasis on cultural pluralism as the best blueprint for a developing America began to supplant the old assimilationist approach.

Functions of Bilingualism and Demands for Bilingual Education

The period of time from the early decades of this century to the present represents a pattern of differing functions of bilingualism for different minority groups. Those groups of European or Asiatic descent whose first members instituted foreign language newspapers and ethnic organizations found their bilingualism functional in the home and family setting and in the more expressive areas of community life. These groups found economic niches available and learned English to function in the economic sphere. Sometimes they

set up their own educational structures, often associated with the religious institutions, to perpetuate their own language. Second generation members of these groups often refused to learn the parental tongue, feeling that this inhibited assimilation; but there is evidence that the third generation reactivate interest, as Hansen predicted (Hansen), and becomes receptive to bilingual attainment for purposes of sentiment or expressive goals or to resolve marginal feelings. There are currently over 2,000 ethnic group schools in the U.S., of which over half offer mother tongue instruction. These schools are to some extent pupiled by assimilated members interested in the continuity of the parental culture.

Based on field work done with members of the Middle Eastern minority group of a large Southern city, the author has found that in a group of 88 persons, representing three generations, almost 65% reported the ability to speak and understand Arabic. Futher, 79.5% held the opinion that Middle Eastern children should be trained in the Arabic language. This group would seem to represent an example of a situation where, despite the presence of some prejudice and discrimination from the dominant society, educational and economic success have been possible. Bilingualism, within the general framework of equality, has become valued for its own sake, as opposed to being seen as a means to assimilation; other evidence from the study suggests that a pattern of cultural pluralism, in the ideal sense, has begun to emerge for the group in question. Another researcher (Rouchdy), studying bilingual youngsters in an Arabic-speaking Detroit setting, has pointed out that since Arabic is the socially dominant language of the community in question, it should be part of the school curriculum there. This demand invokes policy questions related the the official

structures of the society and carries the question of the functions of bilingualism to a different level.

Do minority groups have a right to bilingual education? If so, under what circumstances does this right exist? How can the demand for this right be expressed so as to bring a response from those who hold the decision-making power?

Over and above the complex mosaic of rather small ethnic groups of European and Asiatic national origin exemplified above, there exist in the American social order several groups, varying in size, who have borne such a burden of institutionalized discrimination as to have been effectively blocked from the possibility of upward mobility and assimilation. Spanish-speaking Americans and Native Americans, speaking one of a great number of Indian languages, are cases in point. Spanish-speaking Americans are not a unified single ethic group, however. Mixican Americans, concentrated in the South West, are the largest Spanish-speaking group. This group presents a perfect example of the pattern referred to above where two groups who are linguistically differentiated coexist in a community on a basis of unequal status. In many ways the plight of most Mexican Americans has been similar to that of the American Black. Segregation, both de facto and de jure, in school and other institutional patterns, the poorest jobs, the lowest pay, the least schooling, the least chance for upward mobility have been pervasive. Low test scores on achievement tests were used as evidence that use of Spanish had a damaging effect on learning while the quality of schools, differentials in pupil expenditures, near absence of Mexican American teachers, depressing family problems, were ignored. Spanish was discouraged or forbidden as offical policy.

During the sixties there was a resurgence of group spirit within minorities throughout the nation; Mexican Americans participated in this mass movement avenue out of marginal feelings. La Raza Unida, for example, among many, aimed at changing the unequal distribution of prestige, power and wealth. Concentrating on the cultural heritage as well as political goals, this movement was part of a general pressure brought to bear on the dominant official society to offer redress for wrongs of the past.

In 1968, in response to the growing demand for recognition of minority cultural contributions and languages, Congress passed an amendment incorporated as Title VII to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 making provision for bilingual education advances. The main features of the program involve allocation of money to local schools for purposes of teaching the native language, Spanish in this case, as the first language, teaching English as the second language, generating pride in the ancestral culture and language of minority students, attracting and training of teachers from the minorities in question, closer cooperation between school and home. In short, the bill seemed designed to provide an educational framework for true cultural pluralism, developing a student body that would be adequately facile in two languages, with English as one in which proficiency was attained.

A reading of the Hearings held before the Subcommittees of the Senate and in the House, however, reveal a clear difference of ultimate goal between the lawmakers and the exponents of bilingualism who came to testify. Repeatedly, the senators expressed the old assimilationist approach. Thus, Senator Yarborough (Part I, 37) of Texas remarked:

> Non-English-speaking groups.....made a definite decision to leave their old life and culture and come here to a new country and set up a way of life here in accordance with ours, and we assumed they were consenting at that time to give up their language, too.

Or, more specifically addressing the Mexican American issue, Senator Fannin (Part I, 16) of Arizona stated:

> Any attempt to separate them from the Anglo-American community, of which they have been and are part and parcel, can only retard their progress, if not immediately then in the years to come.

In a very real sense, the law-makers viewed the bilingual education program as avenues to assimilate minority members into the mainstreams of society; their interest in cultural pluralism was guarded, or perhaps, non-existent.

The witnesses, on the other hand, tended to set forth the need for a new emphasis on diversity. Professor Joshua Fishman, (Part I, 23), stated

> ....Support for bilingual language maintenance is advocated on the ground that our national genius and our national promise depend upon a more conscious and a better implemented commitment to a permanently culturally pluralistic society.

He typifies the minority point of view on this issue.

The passing of the bill was a more symbolic than real victory, whatever the goals which could be implemented. For minority group members the pressure for and attainment of such a bill was a way of communicating: "We are tired of second-class citizenship and the devaluing of our heritage. We have the political clout to get a bill passed and we want dominant group members to take notice."

For the law-makers, the message being sent out seemed to express, "We are committed to our minorities and want them to have a better chance to be

like the dominant group." The fact is that the money allocated was insufficient to make feasible anything but token bilingual and bicultural programs. The intent was for local and state educational agencies to take up the programs and make them permanent after the federally-funded experiments were tried.

As of a report (Moore) for 1972-73, there were 120 programs funded to serve Mexican American children, these reaching less than 2 per cent of the Chicano children in the Southwest---even when supplemented by certain state-funded programs. This indicates the dimensions of the problem and the inadequacy of the solutions that have been provided. Yet the law does carry symbolic implications for future patterns that are important.

One other point is relevant to the Mexican-American mass tactics to improve the status of the entire group. Building on maneuvers learned during the sixties, many local communities have begun to demand more participation at the local level in the school system, its offerings and policies. Community control of public schools has been an issue through which depressed minorities have worked for a more equal share of the power, hence, a better footing in the fight for cultural pluralism.

One last straw in the wind is significant to the fate of bilingual education in the United States. In January 1974 in a class action suit, Lau vs. Nichols, for Chinese students of San Francisco, the United States Supreme Court held the San Francisco school system's failure to provide special programs designed to rectify the English language deficiency of children of Chinese ancestry and to provide equal access to these students to the district's instructional program a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Though the questions of remedy were left unresolved, the

implication of the decision for more bilingual education is clear. In fact, there has been considerable effort at finding possible feasible solutions to this problem.

Conclusions

In summary, the history of the twentieth century in American intercultural communication patterns has been one of a gradual shift away from the melting pot assimilationist ideology of the first few decades toward a recognition of the diversity in language and culture that continues to characterize the society. The stratification of the society along lines of racial and ethnic diversity, with some groups almost totally excluded from access to the rewards of wealth, prestige and power, has given rise in the period since the mid-fifties to pressure for a more pluralistic social order in which feelings of inferiority and marginality can be combatted more effectively through movements and political tactics. The official governmental structures, especially at the national level, have responded to these tactics with programs designed to promote opportunities for upward mobility and pride in cultural heritage, thus establishir a different framework for future intercultural communication.

References

Adamic, Louis. 1938. My America. New York: Harper and Row.

Addams, Jane. 1914. Twenty Years at Hull-House. New York: Macmillan.

Carmichael, Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton. 1967. Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan. 1963. Beyond the Melting Pot. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press and Harvard University Press.

Gordon, Milton M. 1941. "A Qualification of the Marginal Man Theory." Reprinted in Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Hansen, Marcus L. 1937. The Problem of the Third Generation Immigrant. Rock Island, Ill.: The Augustana Historical Society.

Hearings, United States House of Representatives, General Subcommittee on Education and Labor. Part I (June 1967), Part II (May 1974), Part III (June, 1977). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Hearings, United States Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, 90th Congress. Part I (May 1967), Part II (June 1967). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Kallen, Horace. 1925. Culture and Democracy in the United States. New York: Boni and Liverwright.

Moore, Joan W. 1976. Mexican Americans. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Park, Robert Ezra. a:1913: "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups." Race and Culture. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950.

Park, Robert Ezra. b:1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." American Journal of Sociology. (May): 881-893.

Rouchdy, Aleya. 1974. "Research on Arab Child Bilinguals." in Arabic Speaking Communities in American Cities. Barbara Aswad, Editor. New York: The Center for Migration Studies.

Stonequist, Everett. 1937. The Marginal Man. New York: Scribners.